

**West Mojave Plan
Task Group 1
Green Tree Inn, Victorville
April 16, 2002**

Attendees

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Ileene Anderson	Ca. Native Plant Soc	Brian Ludicke	City of Lancaster
Ray Bransfield	USFWS	David Matthews	Public
Marie Brashear	CDC, WRA, SPCW	James McRea	City of Ridgecrest
Jackie Campo	Victorville IM	Michael Mulligan	CDFG
L. Andrea Clark	Inyo County	Lorelei Oviatt	Kern Co. Planning
Paul Condon	Consultant/Mines Ex.	Tim Read	BLM Barstow
Mike Connors	Tortoise interest grps.	Dave Reno	City of Hesperia
Tom Dailor	LADWP	Bob Sackett	Desert Vipers MC
Joe Decruyencese	L.A. Co. Planning	Jim Schroeter	California City
Sonya Earll	CHARIS/NTC	Brenda Simmons	City of 29 Palms
Clarence Everly	Dept. of Defense	Matt Slowik	S.B. Co. Planning
Mark Hagan	Edwards AFB	Steve Smith	BLM Ridgecrest
Gerry Hillier	S. B. County	Deborah Stevens	AVTREC
Chuck Holloway	LA DWP	Robert Strub	Trona
Becky Jones	CDFG	Rocky Thompson	CDFG
Peter Kiriakos	Sierra Club	Barbara Veale	People for the USA
Paul Kober	CORVA	Robert Williams	MANDACA Des. Assoc.
Gene Kulesza	TXI and MDMAC		
Laurie Lile	City of Palmdale	Darrell Wong	CDFG

West Mojave Team: Bill Haigh, Larry LaPre, Ed LaRue, Valery Pilmer.

Introduction

Bill Haigh opened the meeting at 9:40 A.M. and introductions were made. Haigh asked the group members to e-mail any changes to the March 21, 2002 meeting notes to him.

Bill Haigh provided a brief report on the Rand Mountains. Haigh indicated that the BLM will not propose any changes to the Rand Mountains/Fremont Valley Plan through the West Mojave Plan. Rather, the West Mojave Plan will be the vehicle to implement plan amendments called for in the Rand Plan. The route closures in the Rand Mountains ACEC will remain until compliance is in order. Gerry Hillier asked why the compliance issue contained in the Biological Opinion (BO) as a recommendation was elevated to a mandatory program. Haigh responded that although the compliance requirement was not listed as a formal "term and condition", it was discussed twice

elsewhere in the biological opinion and is being treated as a term and condition of the BO. Ray Bransfield added that Section 9 of the Endangered Species act would be violated if the terms and conditions of the BO are not implemented.

Tortoise “Clean-up” Issues - Final Review

- **Education**

Ed LaRue noted that the Implementation Committee would actually prepare the education program. LaRue also noted that he had requested an example of an education program from Morongo Unified School District, but had not received a response. He has not had a chance to contact Needles School District. The program should build on what already exists. The following points were discussed:

- Dave Matthews asked that language be added to prevent someone from putting forth their own agenda (e.g., peer review of materials).
- Debbie Stevens noted that a local high school built a wetlands area and a video of that was shown on the local TV station. She indicated this would be a good example to follow.
- Peter Kiriakos suggested that an educational information repository/exchange be developed to provide a single source where participating jurisdictions can go for guidance and information for their own education programs.
- Matt Slowik suggested getting the information out to the non-desert areas. He noted that California State University, San Bernardino is spearheading an information center to share educational information.
- Peter Kiriakos agreed that many public land users live outside the desert area and that the media needs to be used to reach these people.
- Mike Connor asked that a mechanism be added to evaluate the effectiveness of the education program. Andrea Clark added that accurately defined goals and targets will be needed in order to properly evaluate effectiveness.
- Ileene Anderson asked whether the program will be contained in the implementation section of the plan. Bill Haigh replied that the West Mojave Team will be preparing an implementation section that will lay out and price the various programs.
- Peter Kiriakos indicated that it is critical to tie the education program into adaptive management (a comment loop is needed).
- Bill Haigh noted that Denis Kearns provided the basic structure for the education program, and expressed his thanks for the assistance.

- **Standard Stipulations**

Ed LaRue noted that San Bernardino County expressed concern that using the complete list of standard stipulations outside of the DWMA's would be overly restrictive. In response to this concern, LaRue has pulled together a subset of the standards that would

apply within the survey areas of the ITA. Bill Haigh noted that the standards for the DWMA's and survey areas would be renamed "Best Management Practices (BMPs)" and included as an appendix to the plan. LaRue added that the document includes guidelines for the different types of fencing referenced in the plan and how these fencing types are used. The following points were made during the discussion:

- Several questions were asked about the relationship between the three levels of mitigation fees and the survey/no survey areas. LaRue explained that different criteria was used for determining the fee areas and the survey/no survey areas. Laurie Lile explained that the Compensation Subcommittee recommended that the fee program be kept simple, and that all areas participate in the compensation program. Lile noted that even the loss of infill areas as habitat could have an impact on some of the species addressed by the plan.
- Lorelei Oviatt expressed concern with item 4 on page 18 of the handout which requires the Authorized Biologist to complete a zone of influence survey in adjacent, undeveloped areas if no tortoise sign is found in the Impact Area. Oviatt noted that it would be difficult for a project proponent to obtain permission from adjacent property owners to survey their property. LaRue stated that this measure is consistent with current protocol. Ray Bransfield indicated that this protocol may need to be reevaluated and questioned whether it is reasonable to force a survey on someone else's property. Oviatt suggested adding language that would establish criteria for when a survey on adjacent property would be critical. Laurie Lile added that if an adjacent property owner won't give permission, the local jurisdiction cannot require that the property be surveyed. Ray Bransfield suggested surveying the property to be developed, and accessing the biological data base to determine the likelihood of tortoises on adjacent properties.
- Mike Connor questioned the meaning of item 16 on page 5. Ed LaRue responded that this item primarily references surveys on pipeline areas. Lorelei Oviatt noted that this is the same issue as contained in item 4 on page 18. Oviatt noted that surveys beyond the project may be of more importance in the DWMA areas and suggested using the item 4, page 18 language here. Laurie Lile questioned whether it would be better to simply require a temporary fence to keep tortoises from reentering the site after being cleared. Oviatt indicated that the language needs to allow for some discretion (e.g., if there have been no occurrences of tortoises in the area for the past 15 years, a temporary fence is unnecessary). Oviatt noted she is recommending a change for the ITA only, not for the DWMA. Ray Bransfield recommended keeping the language broad enough to allow for some discretion, and indicated that the survey areas will likely change over time in response to new survey information. Becky Jones cautioned that just because surveys do not show tortoises in an area, does not necessarily mean they are not there. Peter Kiriakos indicated he concurred with the use of temporary fences. Bill Haigh noted that LaRue will make revisions reflecting the discussion and will get those out to the group.

- Peter Kiriakos asked that the language excluding pets from construction sites be broadened to include guard dogs. Bob Strub indicated he would like to see guard dogs allowed. LaRue noted that this provision applies to the DWMA only, not to the ITA. Kiriakos noted that if guard dogs are allowed, then precautions need to be taken.
- Peter Kiriakos expressed concern that take avoidance measures have not been discussed for covered species other than tortoise. Larry LaPre indicated that there is no survey requirement for the remaining species with the exception of burrowing owls and bats. In response to questions, Bill Haigh indicated that take avoidance measures could be developed for the burrowing owl but not for the Mohave ground squirrel.
- Ileene Anderson asked how sensitive plants will be protected within DWMAs if they have no specific conservation area (e.g., crucifixion thorn). She would like to see specific conservation measures developed for these species. Pete Kiriakos agreed that measures need to be developed for these and other species. Larry LaPre indicated that the main mitigation for the other species is the 1% cap, the 5:1 mitigation, and acquisition of land containing those species. It was noted that areas containing multiple species are likely to have a high priority for acquisition. LaPre also noted that there is not much activity, and therefore not much threat to these species in the DWMAs, and BLM can require avoidance on public lands. Ray Bransfield stated that LaPre's comments need to be included in the plan to provide a clear statement of what the strategy for plants will be. Bransfield added that the implementation team should target the parcels with sensitive plants for purchase, and that this needs to be clearly stated in the plan or the plan will not be approved. Ileene Anderson stated that CNPS cannot support just 5:1 mitigation with no take avoidance measures in the HCA.
- Peter Kiriakos would like to see assurances from the jurisdictions that proper restrictions will be in place for the HCA. Kiriakos noted that the Sierra Club wants the jurisdictions to change their zoning and general plans to conform to the HCA. Ileene Anderson indicated that the 1% cap should answer this concern. Lorelei Oviatt indicated that the 1% cap is a considerable compromise on the part of the jurisdictions and that findings will have to be made by decision makers that a project is consistent with all plans, including the West Mojave Plan, prior to approval. Gerry Hillier noted that in the DWMA, linear projects such as pipelines and mining are the most likely projects to occur. Hillier added that these projects are subject to terms and conditions, and that he did not believe the board of supervisors would consider zone changes. Hillier suggested that this issue emphasizes the importance of considering development that exists on the fringes of the DWMAs and making adjustments to exclude areas that may be developed in the near future. Matt Slowik agreed that changes in the DWMA boundary should

be considered up front, and added that most development will not target DWMA areas because of the lack of infrastructure needed for development to occur.

- David Matthews, referencing item 4 on page 18, asked for clarification of who pays the biologist. Ed LaRue responded that the developer/project proponent will pay. LaRue clarified that the cost to developers would be less than under current management since only a clearance survey will be required in lieu of the now required presence/absence survey in addition to the clearance survey.
- Mike Connor asked that references to “tortoise activity period” be modified to indicate that tortoises are less active during certain periods than others. Connor indicated that it is inaccurate to state that tortoises are not active during certain periods of the year. Bill Haigh indicated that staff will modify the language accordingly.
- Becky Jones asked for the following changes:
 - 1) Item 3 on page 3 regarding Environmental Monitor: Clarify that the Environmental Monitor can do the clearance survey, but that if a tortoise is encountered, it may only be moved by the Authorized Biologist.
 - 2) Add that the Field Contact Representative must be an Authorized Biologist.
 - 3) Item 19, page 6: Add to end of first sentence “...by the Authorized Biologist.”
 - 4) Item 29, page 7: Change first part of first sentence to read “All open holes shall be covered, fenced, or inspected....”

Jones noted that if it is an emergency, the Environmental Monitor may handle a tortoise.

Ed LaRue noted that item 14 on page 19 needs to be added to the section on DWMA's.

Chuck Holloway expressed concern about the requirement that work be done by the Authorized Biologist rather than the Environmental Monitor. He indicated that the pool of Authorized Biologists is very limited, and that it is difficult to get biologists authorized. Holloway indicated concern that this requirement could impact ongoing maintenance for the LADWP. Ed LaRue indicated that maintenance is one activity that would not be affected by the measures. LaRue also indicated that the Implementation Team will maintain a list of Authorized Biologists for use by project proponents. Ray Bransfield added that if crews are out inspecting utility lines, they will need to be educated on what to do if they encounter a tortoise, but they will not be required to have an Authorized Biologist with them. Bob Strub noted that disturbances for pipelines and utilities might be very narrow, and suggested that once reclaimed, this type of use should receive

back the full mitigation credit. Strub would like to see this included in the Habitat Credit component. Gerry Hillier noted that it appears the intent would be for the jurisdictions to include the BMPs and stipulations in the permits issued to individual projects. Hillier noted that these BMPs need to be in the hands of the environmental monitor. Peter Kiriakos requested that language be added that would require the BMPs be added to the local jurisdiction permit.

Lorelei Oviatt indicated that she has broken the process outside of the Tortoise DWMA's down into the following steps.

Within the survey area: (1) Applicant hires biologist from list; (2) Clearance survey conducted prior to ground disturbance (February 15 to November 15 - 48 hours prior; November 16 to February 14 - several days or weeks prior); (3) Decision by the biologist: if No, convey information, leave a brochure and submit a written report to the Implementation Team, if Yes, Inform applicant to implement BLPs, and submit a written report to the Implementation Team; and (4) Applicant proceeds to pay mitigation fee and receives permit.

Outside of the survey area: (1) Planning Department identifies it as a non-survey area; (2) Education brochure provided; and (3) Applicant pays mitigation fee and receives permit.

- **HCA Structure**

Bill Haigh noted that with the BMPs being applied to the survey areas, the concept of tortoise Special Review Areas (SRA) may be redundant. He raised the possibility of dropping the SRAs, noting that the survey areas cover considerably more than the SRA areas (Brisbane Valley and Copper Mesa area). Considerable discussion took place on this issue as follows:

- Mike Connor indicated that the two SRA areas are places where we know that tortoises are likely to be encountered and feels they should remain. Ed LaRue explained that there is little difference between the take avoidance measures recommended in the survey areas and in the SRAs.
- Bob Sackett asked that competition be included as a recreational event in the BMPs. Ed LaRue indicated that the measures developed for the DWMA's would not allow competitive events within the DWMA's. Sackett added this remains a concern for his group.
- Several individuals asked that a map be put together to display this issue more clearly. Hillier noted that San Bernardino County has yet to have a full discussion regarding the DWMA, BTA, SRA concept, but will within the next month or two. Having a clear map available would help with this discussion.
- Mike Connor suggested that the SRAs are more important than the remaining survey areas, and feels that temporary fencing should be required in the SRAs after

clearance surveys to keep tortoises off the project site.

As a result of the discussion, the suggestion to drop the SRA concept was withdrawn.

Peter Kiriakos expressed concern that survey requirements and additional compensation for other species had not been addressed. Lorelei Oviatt stated that the Compensation Subcommittee had recommended a simple structure with no additional fee required in areas with multiple species. Oviatt indicated that Kern County would not buy into the program if the mitigation program is additive for multiple species. Oviatt added that the county might be open to discussion on plants, but was unaware how the other jurisdictions might feel about that issue. Mike Connor feels this remains an issue and is concerned that environmental representatives were excluded from the Compensation Subcommittee discussions. Connor suggested consideration of two levels of compensation within the DWMA to address the multi-species issue. Marie Brashear also expressed concern with the lack of information on how other covered species within the DWMA, without a specified conservation area, will be addressed. Bill Haigh noted that the group did not seem comfortable with reliance on the 1% cap for other species.

Ileene Anderson stated that CNPS's goal is to get adequate mitigation for plants. She indicated that 5:1 mitigation is sufficient if you can find tortoise and plant habitat together. She is concerned that the 5:1 mitigation fee will go towards tortoise habitat, but not plant habitat. Larry LaPre noted that the concept of "directed mitigation" had been discussed, but not resolved, and added that this is difficult to carry out. Marie Brashear suggested that if mitigation was received from a project affecting plant habitat, that those dollars could be placed in a separate "pot" by the Implementation Team. Brashear noted this would keep it simple for the jurisdictions, but address Ileene's concerns. Ray Bransfield agreed with the concept of discretion at the Implementation Team level, and noted that a very small proportion of projects in Kern and San Bernardino County are proposed within the DWMA. Bill Haigh indicated that staff will adjust the plan to put more discretion in the hands of the Implementation Committee, and will consider the concept of additive mitigation as an alternative in the EIR/S.

Bransfield would like to make certain that the HCP and environmental impact report and statement fully document the fact that historically very few projects are proposed in the DWMA area, and that this is likely to be the case in the future. Bransfield noted that this is important information if USFWS is going to approve the plan.

Debbie Stevens expressed concern with the scale of the display maps and indicated it is difficult to tell what areas are affected. Ed LaRue noted that detailed maps are available for review.

Lunch: 12:20 PM to 1:20 PM

Tortoise Headstarting Discussion: Dr. David Morafka

Dr. David Morafka presented information regarding headstarting to the Task Group. The following points were made during the presentation:

- Headstarting is an experimental program. At best the program is a 10% solution to the decline of the tortoise - not a 90% solution. With the continuing dramatic decline in tortoise populations, scientists are now willing to try this approach to see if it will work or not.
- A program was started at Fort Irwin in 1990. The purpose was twofold: 1) A window to observe juvenile tortoises to see what their needs are (juvenile tortoises are very difficult to observe in the field); and 2) Intervention to stabilize or enhance tortoise population. He noted that the program needs to be part of a more comprehensive effort, otherwise it would be meaningless.
- “Little tortoises are not just like big tortoises.” Very dramatic changes take place during the first year of life. Neonates emerge in the fall at a time when there is little rainfall. Stored yolk sacs help carry them through this period and provide energy for dispersion. The yolk sac can carry them through the first four to six months. The young will disperse 200 to 2000 meters from the nest. The young used pre-formed rodent burrows to hibernate. First year survivorship in good habitat is 50 to 60 percent.
- Three hatchery nursery units would be established as follows:
 - 1) Female tortoises would be gathered from surrounding continuous habitat and released into the pens to deposit their eggs in pre-formed burrows.
 - 2) Females would be screened for any diseases or parasites.
 - 3) After egg deposition, females would be returned to their natural burrows in the field.
 - 4) Three pen treatments would be established:
 - Fast track hatcheries-no supplemental water . Neonates would be released in the fall after hatching or during their first spring following hibernation.
 - Fast track hatcheries - supplemental water. Site would be watered at the equivalent of mean winter rainfall, and neonates would be released in summer.
 - Slow track hatcheries-supplemental water. Tortoises would be confined for up to 7 years, or until young tortoises body mass, shell size and hardness reduces the threat of raven predation.

A control group would be used to assess whether headstarting increases recruitment at a rate greater than the control group.

The intent of research is to have the smallest degree of intervention necessary to make a difference in tortoise populations.

Sites being considered for headstarting include those with good habitat, but severely depleted of tortoises.

Possible liabilities of the effort include:

- 1) Tracking devices could result in shell deformation.
- 2) Effort may help propagate disease.

3) If neonates are released in a burst, raven predation may be increased. Pete Kiriakos recommended consideration of a fork type arrangement as the below ground portion of the pens. Kiriakos sees the effort as a research component of the plan and not necessarily a measure expected to repopulate areas with tortoises. He noted that more research is needed.

Mike Connor asked whether it would be easier to protect the nests where they are in the wild. Dr. Morafka responded that this may be more difficult in the warmer west Mojave area. Connor also noted that pens can be subjected to vandalism. It was noted that pens would have to be carefully monitored and watched.

Tim Read asked whether captive animals might be used. Dr. Morafka responded that this would occur only as a last resort. It is preferable to use animals from the surrounding area.

Bill Haigh noted that the planning team will continue to work with Dr. Morafka to refine a program for the West Mojave.

Habitat Credit Component

Ed LaRue referenced the three page handout on this issue. He noted that the subcommittee working on this issue involved only two people, and that additional input is needed from the Task Group. The following discussion occurred on this item:

Bob Strub noted that the proposed success criteria is higher than that required by the State of California under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act for reclamation. Mike Connor indicated that there is a significant difference between “reclamation” and “restoration.” Becky Jones indicated that in order to get credit for habitat, the site needs to be restored to a level where it can be used by the species. Strub recommended including an incentive program such as requiring a lesser degree of revegetation if mining reclamation includes slopes no steeper than 6:1. Strub also recommended a less stringent standard for restoration of narrow strips of land, such as pipelines.

Mark Hagan noted that acquiring good habitat is less expensive and easier than restoring habitat. Hagan noted that the success criteria are provided as a way to measure/quantify success.

Lorelei Oviatt asked that it be clarified that only lands within the DWMA are being targeted for purchase.

Gene Kulesza indicated that the proposal is a good start that just needs polishing.

Andrea Clark stated that short and long term goals need to be established so credits can be tracked.

Dave Matthews asked who gets the credit, who restores, and who is paying for it. Lorelei Oviatt offered the following example of how it might work: An individual wants to develop, but the county is approaching the 1% cap level in the DWMA. That individual could pay for and restore degraded habitat elsewhere so that they can develop. Oviatt noted that it might not be a straight 1:1, and agrees that it is not clear since restoration takes a

long time. She also noted that a company might want to create a mitigation bank now, that could be used or bought into by others later. Oviatt also noted that the board of supervisors could authorize money for restoration, although she does not see this happening as much as individual funding. It was noted that West Mojave funds would not be used for restoration to buy back credits.

Tim Read suggested that a control plot be established to refine an ecological site index. LaRue noted that there is a danger that someone would independently decide to do restoration. He indicated that it is critical that any proposal goes through the Implementation Team.

Andrea Clark asked that a means be established for pipeline and corridor disturbances to be restored and subtracted from the 1% disturbance. It was noted that it might be possible for something less than 1:1 to be credited for such uses recognizing that maintenance roads and associated areas will always remain disturbed, while the actual pipeline can be restored.

Laurie Lile pointed out the need to document that restoration will not occur over a short period of time. She noted that there needs to be some on-going monitoring and documentation, and that it may be possible to rebate original fees if restoration of the disturbed areas succeeds (pay first - rebate later).

Ileene Anderson noted that it is incredibly expensive to restore land, and the limited amount of dollars available would be best spent acquiring undisturbed areas.

Becky Jones indicated that any credit for restoration of a project must be above and beyond what is required for mitigation.

Ed LaRue noted that it would be helpful if the Implementing Team could identify restorable areas.

Marie Brashear stated that the Implementation Team needs to identify a priority list for acquisition. Darrell Wong responded that if property appears on a list, the price for that land may go up. Mike Connor expressed concern that the higher priced land that contains multiple species may not be purchased simply because it is more expensive. Brashear noted that some properties may not agree to sell at "fair market value", and that since government agencies may only be able to purchase if sold at this value, some other tool, such as a third party non-profit entity may need to be involved.

Peter Kiriakos stated that the plan needs to include a discussion of restoration programs, techniques, and costs.

Bob Strub indicated he did not agree with the program as proposed. Bill Haigh asked Strub to provide any alternative proposal to him in writing.

Bill Haigh indicated that the structure for implementation of the plan will be prepared by West Mojave Team staff. Pete Kiriakos asked that interests other than local jurisdictions be invited to provide input into the implementation program.

DWMA Adjustments

Ed LaRue reviewed the staff proposed adjustments to the DWMA as follows:

- 1) On the north side of the Pinto DWMA, extend the north boundary northwards to Highway 62. This area is contiguous to the DWMA, contains mostly public lands, and the highway makes for a more recognizable boundary.
- 2) North of Silver Lakes, include a seven square mile area in the DWMA.
- 3) North of Barstow, delete an area on the southern edge of the DWMA that has already been developed and is all private land.
- 4) Include an area between the DWMA and the Johnson Valley Open Area.

The following discussion occurred:

- Bob Sackett expressed concern about the extension of the DWMA south to the Johnson Valley Open Area. He is concerned that someone may identify a need to “buffer” the DWMA in the future and reduce the open area. Bill Haigh noted that BLM State Director Mike Pool has indicated that open area boundaries will not be changed.
- Matt Slowik asked whether private lands were included in the proposed expansions. Ed LaRue indicated there is some private land, but that it is minimal.
- Brenda Simmons asked where the western boundary for the expansion north of the Pinto DWMA is. Ed LaRue responded that the western boundary follows the corporate boundary for the City of Twentynine Palms.
- Mike Connor indicated that he finds it extremely difficult to discuss the boundary for the DWMA without information on grazing prescriptions and route designation.
- Marie Brashear asked why some of the DWMA expansions weren't proposed as BTAs rather than as DWMA's. Ed LaRue responded that he was looking for a way to provide more recognizable boundaries for the DWMA's.

The boundary adjustments proposed by others were presented as follows:

- 1) Paul Kober proposed adjusting the DWMA boundary near El Mirage to north of Shadow Mountain Road. He indicated that there is private property and homes in this area that should be outside the DWMA. He also indicated that the terrain is steep and not suitable for tortoises. Ray Bransfield suggested taking a closer look at this area and the relative background data, including the El Mirage Management Plan, to determine whether or not a change should be made. Bill Haigh agreed with Bransfield's comments and suggested that Ed LaRue also look at the area in the field.
- 2) Paul Condon described a proposed adjustment near the northern boundary of California City. The proposed exclusion would follow the proposed deannexation boundary of the city, and would exclude a subdivision from the DWMA that the city is under a court order to provide services to. Mike Connor wants to ensure that land owned by the Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee remains in the DWMA. Bill Haigh asked the City representatives to look at this issue and see whether a smaller exclusion would meet the needs of both parties.
- 3) A request was made for the DWMA to follow Garlock Road, south of the El Paso

Mountains. Bob Sackett noted that there is considerable camping going on in the strip of land between Garlock Road and the railroad. CORVA would prefer to see the boundary placed along the railroad. Paul Kober is concerned about connectivity between the Rand Mountains and the Red Rock Canyon State Park, and noted that the railroad tracks are a barrier to the tortoise. Mike Connor pointed out that the railroad is on trestles over a wash and that wildlife can go around and under the railroad. Connor agrees with the road as the boundary. Bill Haigh indicated he will take the comments into consideration and make a decision.

- 4) Paul Condon presented a request by Mines Exploration to delete additional lands from the DWMA around Randsburg and east of Atolia. The area has mining claims and tungsten deposits (one of ten in the US) that might be mined in the future. Mike Connor pointed out that the eastern end of the proposed exclusion is within the grazing allotment his group is concerned about and would like to keep in the DWMA. Ray Bransfield indicated that he would not agree to removing this area from the DWMA as it would block connectivity. Becky Jones agreed with Bransfield. Gene Kulesza would like to see this areas specially noted as tungsten may be needed strategically at some point. Bill Haigh indicated this area would be reviewed further.

The group determined that another meeting would be necessary to discuss DWMA boundary adjustments. Haigh indicated that if anyone has any further changes to propose, to note the change on a map and send it to the West Mojave Team.

Next Meeting

Haigh recommended that another meeting be scheduled in mid-May to allow for consideration of grazing, route designation, and any final DWMA boundary adjustments.

Haigh noted that Task Group 2 will meet on April 24th, and the Supergroup will meeting on April 30th. Scoping meetings will be held the last week in May and the first week in June.

The next and final Task Group 1 meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 15, 2002 at 9:30 AM at the Green Tree Inn, Victorville. It was noted that the following items will be on the agenda for that meeting:

- 1) Grazing Strategy
- 2) Route Designation in the DWMA's
- 3) Cumulative Mitigation
- 4) Compensation Map
- 5) Latest Scorecard and Take Avoidance for Other Species
- 6) HCA Boundary Adjustments